

Serial No.: 09/852,994

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10 and 14-19 are pending in the application upon entry of this amendment. Claims 3, 8 and 11-13 have been canceled and replaced with claims 15-19. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indicated allowability of claim 9 subject to being amended to Independent form.

II. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claim 1, the sole independent claim, has been amended to include many of the features of allowable 9. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended herein to recite "*limiting means comprising an isolation layer whose lateral extension is wider than the laser's waveguide ridge*". Such features were previously included in claims 3 and 9. Accordingly, such amendment does not raise any new issues of patentability and entry is respectfully requested. Moreover, such amendment incorporating features of allowable claim 9 is believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 4-7, 9, 10 and 14 are amended herein to eliminate redundancy and to provide proper dependency. Dependent claims 15-19 are provided to round out the dependent claim coverage.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-7 AND 14 UNDER 35 USC §102(e)

Claims 1-7 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) based on *Yu et al.* Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate relevant features of allowable claim 9. Specifically, amended claim 1 recites "*limiting means comprising an isolation layer whose lateral extension is wider than the laser's waveguide ridge*".

Yu et al. describes the use of three-current blocking layers, each of which is congruent to the overlaying metal layer. *Yu et al.* does not teach or suggest an isolation

Serial No.: 09/852,994

layer whose lateral extension is *wider* than the laser's waveguide ridge as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 together with dependent claims 2-7 and 14 is respectfully requested.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIM 10 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Yu et al.*

Claim 10 depends from claim 1, and may be distinguished over *Yu et al.* for at least the same reasons recited above. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

V. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Serial No.: 09/852,994

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELIE & SKLAR, LLP


Mark D. Saralino
Registration No. 34,243

DATE: September 29, 2003

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
C:\GENABA\labacp105.aaf.wpd

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 30 2003

OFFICIAL